

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-9 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1-9 were rejected. With this Amendment, claims 1, 2 and 9 were amended. Accordingly, claims 1-9 are at issue in the above-identified application.

**Information Disclosure Statement**

In response to the Examiner's refusal to consider the Japanese Patent Documents identified in the information disclosure statement filed on May 13, 2005, Applicants submit herewith this response copies of the following documents:

<u>Number</u>	<u>Country</u>	<u>Date of Publication</u>
JP11-329742	Japan	November 30, 1999
JP09-326297	Japan	December 16, 1997
JP10-172756	Japan	June 26, 1998

Accordingly, consideration of the foregoing Japanese references is respectfully requested.

**35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims**

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Mochizuki et al.* (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0105267). By this Amendment, independent claim 1 has been amended to more clearly recite the scope of the invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to recite that light generated by the light emitting devices is extracted outside of the display unit in a direction from the light emitting devices

toward the first and second prisms (see e.g., Fig. 3 of pending application). This limitation is not taught by *Mochizuki*. Rather, *Mochizuki* discloses that light is reflected outside of the display unit away from the prisms (see e.g., Fig. 3 of *Mochizuki*). Thus, for at least this reason, neither independent claim 1 nor its dependent claims (i.e., claims 2-8), may be anticipated by *Mochizuki*. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

**35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims**

Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mochizuki*, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of *Hosokawa* (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0063517), and claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mochizuki*, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of *Shiotsuka et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,806,414). As explained above, *Mochizuki* does not disclose a display unit where light generated by the light emitting devices is extracted outside of the display unit in a direction from the light emitting devices toward the first and second prisms. Moreover, neither *Hosokawa* nor *Shiotsuka* teach this limitation either. Thus, neither independent claim 1 nor any of its dependent claims (including claims 3, 4 and 6) may be found obvious over any combination of these three references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the above-mentioned obviousness rejections be withdrawn.

Claim 9 was rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Spencer* (U.S. Patent No. 5,315,491). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejections. First, it is respectfully submitted that *Spencer* discloses neither a method of manufacturing a display unit, nor an analogous method. Rather, *Spencer* is directed to a reflecting and luminous layered material. Accordingly, it is submitted that *Spencer* is improperly applied as non-analogous art. Thus, one of skill in the art would not have any suggestion or motivation to use light emitting diodes

("LED") in place of the electroluminescent lamps used in the *Spender* material, to come up with the inventive display unit described in the present invention.

Moreover, *Spencer* does not disclose the steps of "forming a prism precursor layer to form a plurality of first prisms to cover a plurality of light emitting devices which are pattern-arranged on a support substrate" and "pattern-forming a plurality of second prisms on a transparent substrate," as suggested by the Examiner. First, there is only one set of prisms included in the inventive material disclosed by *Spencer*, namely the "prism-like formations of underlying surface 158." Further, there is only a single lamp disclosed in the *Spencer* device. Moreover, the Examiner refers to item 150 as being a "transparent substrate." However, layer 150 is actually a retroreflective layer or a "prismatic light reflective material 150." According to the Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, a retroreflector is "device that reflects radiation (as light) so that the paths of the rays are parallel to those of the incident rays." Thus, it is respectfully submitted that *Spencer* does not disclose the step of generating a plurality of prisms on a transparent substrate, nor would such a step be obvious in view of *Spencer*. In fact, the device in *Spencer* would not function appropriately if the layer 150 were wholly transparent, as the reflection of light is a critical feature of the *Spencer* material.

So for at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 9 is not obvious over *Spencer*.


**Conclusion:**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 22, 2005

By:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Alison P. Schwartz  
Registration No. 43,863  
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
P.O. Box 061080  
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080  
(312) 876-8000